

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-45 were presented for examination and claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-45 were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 11, 13, 23 and 30 have been amended and claims 46 and 47 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the new claims can be found at least in paragraphs [0042], [0091] and the description accompanying FIG. 7B. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 30 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**I. Claims 11, 13 and 23 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph**

Claims 11, 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants claim as their invention. Claims 11, 13 and 23 are hereby amended thereby mooting this rejection with respect to these claims. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that claims 11, 13 and 23, as amended, clearly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that Applicants claim as their invention. Thus, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 11, 13 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**II. Claim 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-45 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by US Patent No. 7,100,195 to Underwood (“Underwood”). Claims 2-13 and 18-29 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 1. Claims 32-33, 35-39 and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 30. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Underwood fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 30 patentable over Underwood

Independent claims 1 and 30 are directed towards a method and a system, respectively, for providing authorized remote access to one or more application sessions. These independent claims recite a collection agent gathering information about a client node and a policy engine making an access control decision based on information received from the collection agent. A session server establishes a connection between a client computer and one or more application sessions in response to the received information. Underwood fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Underwood fails to disclose a collection agent gathering information about the client node and a session server establishing a connection between a client computer and one or more application sessions in response to the information. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the information gathered by Underwood is related to a user and a session. However, information about a user and the user’s session is the not the same as information about the client node. The user information of Underwood is agnostic to a particular client node. The user and session information of Underwood is concerned with persistence of a particular user session and

not about making an access control decision based on information collected about the client node. Furthermore, Underwood does not disclose a session server that establishes a connection between a client computer and one or more application sessions. Underwood merely permits a user to access different web pages of an e-commerce website based on the user's session and browsing history. Thus, Underwood fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Since Underwood fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 30 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-13 and 18-29 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 1. Claims 32-33, 35-39 and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 30. Thus, dependent claims 2-13, 18-29, 32-33, 35-39 and 41-45 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIMS

III. Claims 46 and 47 patentable over Underwood

New claims 46 and 47 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. For the reasons discussed above in connection with the rejection of independent claims 1 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 15 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants submit new claims 46 and 47 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Furthermore, dependent claims 46 and 47 provide further basis for patentability of the claimed invention.

Claim 46 cites the information about the client node, as in claim 1, being related to one or more of a machine identification (ID) of the client node, type of an operating system, existence of a patch to the operating system, a Media Access Control (MAC) address of a network card, a digital watermark on the client node, a membership in an Active Directory, an existence of a virus scanner, an existence of a personal firewall, an HTTP header, a browser type, a device type, network connection information, and authorization credentials. As argued above, the information gathered in Underwood is related to a user and the user's session and is not about a client node. Therefore, Underwood fails to disclose the information about a client node as cited in claim 46. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 46 provides further basis for patentability.

Claim 47 is directed towards the connection between a client computer and one or more application sessions being established responsive to a policy engine making an access control decision. Underwood is not directed towards providing remote access to application sessions and fails to disclose establishing a connection between a client computer and one or more application sessions responsive to a policy engine making an access control decision. Hence, Applicants submit that claim 47 also provides further basis for patentability.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 17, 2008

/Christopher J. McKenna/
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000 (phone)
(617) 502-5002 (fax)